



{In Archive} Fw: Mr. Halepaska's Facts

Jose Torres to: Larry Wright, Philip Dellinger, Ray Leissner

07/08/2009 09:51 AM

From: Jose Torres/R6/USEPA/US
To: Larry Wright/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Philip Dellinger/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Ray Leissner/R6/USEPA/US@EPA

History: This message has been forwarded.

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

FYI: Some comments on the Goliad Project, courtesy of Mr. Mark Krueger.

----- Forwarded by Jose Torres/R6/USEPA/US on 07/08/2009 09:57 AM -----



Mr. Halepaska's Facts

Mark Krueger to: Mark Krueger

07/08/2009 07:05 AM

•

• *Originally published July 7, 2009 at 4:45 p.m., updated July 7, 2009 at 4:55 p.m.*

Editor, the Advocate:

I attended the uranium information meeting in Goliad, June 27. I was appalled by the way the meeting was conducted. The meeting was a display of many opinions, some facts and partial facts from a one-sided viewpoint - a viewpoint that is intended to destroy a potential industry in Goliad County.

The opposing viewpoint in support of uranium mining was not represented. The discussions were presented in such a way that people were led to believe that the opinions provided were fact. There are many professionals and scientists who can provide facts and opinions that support the opposing viewpoint.

As a result, the uranium committee and the commissioners are remiss in not providing all the information so that the citizens of Goliad County can make informed decisions or reach informed opinions.

The manner in which the meeting was conducted was much like the "global warming" debate. Experts cannot tell us what the weather is going to do tomorrow, but they expect us to believe global warming conditions 100 years from now, based on questionable opinions. Give me a break. The legal presentation was typical legal jargon based on forming opinions with opinions and partial facts.

Based on discussions I have had with neighbors, the manner in which the one-sided discussion has been presented thus far has managed to scare the heck out of many of them. The people of Goliad need to wake up and use common sense. Opinions are not fact. We are being sold on a concept where the justification is questionable, and in some cases absurd. Legal costs estimated thus far are \$400,000 - what a wasteful use of our tax dollars.

I, too, am a professional. I have provided opinions and recommendations for 36 years. In view of the above, I am not going to provide another opinion only facts as follows:

I am one of the original landowners in the exploration area.

Exploration holes were drilled on my property as early as the 1980s and as recent as last year.

The exploratory holes have been drilled all around my house - 360 degrees.

There are numerous old water wells in the area, some with corroded pipe that have collapsed internally.

There has been much oil and gas activity.

There has been much seismic activity utilizing bore holes all over the area on numerous occasions.

Some of the seismic work utilized explosive charges.

I have seen rainwater running into old seismic holes.

There was an incident relative to the activity in my area that was reported in an untrue manner

against the uranium exploration company.

One last fact: My well water has not changed and seems unaffected by the uranium exploration.

Gary D. Halepeska

Goliad County resident



[markkrueger](#)

•

 [Report a Violation](#)

[permalink](#)

Mr. Halepaska,

Some of the things you state as facts are the same things that are stated by the NRC Generic Environmental Impact Statement to cause the escape of mining fluids, or "excursions".

"An excursion may be caused by:

Improper water balance between injection and recovery rates•

Undetected• high permeability strata or geologic faults

Improperly abandoned• exploration drill holes

Discontinuity within the confining layers•

Poor• well integrity, such as a cracked well casing or leaking joints between casing sections

Hydrofracturing of the ore zone or surrounding units"•

It sounds as if hydrofracturing and improperly abandoned drill holes certainly will apply in this particular situation, not to mention the two faults adjacent to the mining zone.

It would be expected that if the "old wells" you refer to are within proximity of the ore zone that intermingling of water from various zones is already occurring, making the zone unconfined. This is all evidence that In Situ Leach mining should NOT occur in this aquifer zone.

I'm sure EPA is interested in these facts. This information will be extremely helpful in determining whether this aquifer should be exempted from the Safe Drinking Water Act.

July 8, 2009 at 6:52 a.m.